

A Model for Cosmic Self-Acceleration

Gregory Gabadadze

Center for Cosmology and Particle Physics

Department of Physics, New York University, New York, NY, 10003, USA

Abstract

We discuss a model which gives rise to cosmic self-acceleration due to modified gravity. Improvements introduced by this approach are the following: In the coordinate system commonly used, the metric does not grow in the bulk, and no negative mass states are expected to appear. The spectrum of small perturbations contains a localized massless tensor mode, but does not admit dangerous localized massive gravitons. All the massive spin-2 modes are continuum states. The action of the model, which is an extension of DGP, allows to relax the previously known constraint on the bulk fundamental scale of gravity. The latter can take any value below the 4D Planck mass.

1 Introduction

The DGP model [1] admits the self-accelerated solution [2] which could be used to describe [3] the de Sitter (dS) like expansion of the present-day Universe.

The model exhibits strongly-coupled behavior already at the classical level [4]. As a result, the question of stability of the self-accelerated background w.r.t. small perturbations, [5] – [8], becomes difficult [9, 10].

Luckily, certain non-linear solutions have been found. This is a case for a Schwarzschild-like solution, for which the 4D metric was exactly obtained [11], and for the Domain Wall solution for which the full 5D metric was found in Ref. [12]. In both cases, the mass (tension) of the solution gets screened by gravitational effects, and these sources on the self-accelerated background look as if they had a *negative* net 5D mass (tension)¹. This suggests that the self-accelerated background may not be problem-free in the full non-linear theory.

What is a root-cause of this behavior? The self-accelerated solution exists only for a certain choice of the sign of the extrinsic curvature, and this choice is such that it requires a growing metric in the bulk. For instance, in a simplest spatially-flat case, the full 5D metric of the self-accelerated solution takes the form [2]:

$$ds^2 = (1 + H|y|)^2 \{-dt^2 + e^{2Ht} d\vec{x}^2\} + dy^2, \quad (1)$$

where y is the 5th coordinate and H denotes the dS expansion rate of the 4D worldvolume (the latter is labeled here by Cartesian coordinates $(t, \vec{x})$, and we use the 5D coordinate system in which the brane is located at $y = 0$). The unusual feature of the above metric is that it grows in the bulk, even though the worldvolume metric is that of dS space. A linearly growing metric, similar to (1), would have been produced by a *negative* tension 3-brane². The growing metric (1) imprints its “negative” effects on the brane worldvolume through the extrinsic curvature, giving rise to the solutions mentioned in the previous paragraph.

The aim of the present work is to modify the DGP equations in such a way that the new system admits a background that is equivalent to the self-accelerated solution on the 4D brane, however, differs from it in the bulk.

The new solution that we will discuss takes the form:

$$ds^2 = (1 - H|y|)^2 \{-dt^2 + e^{2Ht} d\vec{x}^2\} + dy^2. \quad (2)$$

In order to obtain this solution one needs to flip the sign in front of the extrinsic curvature term in one of the DGP equations, keeping the rest of the equations intact. In section 4 we will discuss how such equations can be obtained by modifying the DGP action. The latter will have an additional benefit: the constraint [1] on the bulk fundamental scale of gravity will be relaxed. This scale, in the present context, can take any value below the 4D Planck mass.

¹In contrast with this, screening of the similar sources on the conventional branch of DGP, leaves them with positive 5D mass (tension) [11, 12].

²This could be in, e.g., 5D Minkowski or Anti de Sitter (AdS) space-time.

The solution (2) is formally identical to that for a 3-brane endowed with a positive 4D cosmological constant (brane tension) which is embedded in 5D empty space in 5D GR [13]. However, unlike the latter, the worldvolume expansion in the present case (2) is due to modified gravity, while the 4D cosmological constant is set to zero. This difference is what is responsible for the modified Friedmann equation, and distinct cosmological evolution on the self-accelerated background.

The spectrum of small perturbations on (2) will differ from that of the 3-brane with tension, as well as from the spectrum on (1). As we will show, the spectrum contains one *massless* spin-2 localized mode, the coupling of which on the brane is $\sim 1/M_{\text{Pl}}^2$, and a continuum of massive spin-2 modes with $m^2 \geq 9H^2/4$, with suppressed couplings on the brane, due to the 4D Einstein-Hilbert (EH) term.

The bulk space in both (1) and (2) is locally equivalent to 5D Minkowski space. In the chosen coordinate system the solution (2) encounters the Rindler horizon at $|y| = H^{-1}$. However, an analytic continuation beyond this point can be performed by employing new coordinates (see, e.g., [14]). In that coordinate system the brane (with closed spatial sections) can be regarded as a 4D dS bubble that is first contracting and then re-expanding in 5D Minkowski space.

2 Flipped equation

We briefly review below the DGP equations and self-accelerated solution (1), and show how modifying one of those equations can give rise to the new solution (2).

Consider the 4D DGP equation written at $y = 0^+$ (we use conventions of [14]):

$$G_{\mu\nu} - m_c(K_{\mu\nu} - g_{\mu\nu}K) = 8\pi G_N T_{\mu\nu}(x). \quad (3)$$

Here, $G_{\mu\nu} = R_{\mu\nu} - g_{\mu\nu}R/2$, is the 4D Einstein tensor for the metric $g_{\mu\nu}(x, y)$; $K = g^{\mu\nu}K_{\mu\nu}$, is the trace of the extrinsic curvature tensor

$$K_{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{2N} (\partial_y g_{\mu\nu} - \nabla_\mu N_\nu - \nabla_\nu N_\mu), \quad (4)$$

and ∇_μ is a 4D covariant derivative w.r.t. the metric $g_{\mu\nu}(x, y)$. We introduced the *lapse* scalar field N , and the *shift* vector field N_μ [15]:

$$g_{\mu 5} \equiv N_\mu = g_{\mu\nu}N^\nu, \quad g_{55} \equiv N^2 + g_{\mu\nu}N^\mu N^\nu. \quad (5)$$

Furthermore, the $\{\mu\nu\}$ equation in the bulk, and the $\{\mu 5\}$ and $\{55\}$ equations read respectively

$$G_{\mu\nu}^{(5)} = 0 \quad \text{for } y \neq 0, \quad (6)$$

$$\nabla^\mu K_{\mu\nu} = \nabla_\nu K, \quad (7)$$

$$R = K^2 - K_{\mu\nu}K^{\mu\nu}. \quad (8)$$

Here $G_{\mu\nu}^{(5)}$ denotes the 5D Einstein tensor for the 5D metric $g_{AB}(x, y)$ ($A, B=0,1,2,3,5$), and $g_{\mu\nu}(x, y)$ is its 4D part. Note that the $\{\mu 5\}$ and $\{55\}$ equations, (7) and (8), should be satisfied in the bulk, $y \neq 0$, as well as on the brane, $y = 0$.

Let us turn to cosmological solutions. The metric is parametrized as follows:

$$ds^2 = -P^2(t, y)dt^2 + Q^2(t, y)\gamma_{ij}dx^i dx^j + \Sigma^2(t, y)dy^2. \quad (9)$$

The self-accelerated solution reads [2]:

$$P(t, y) = 1 + |y| \frac{\ddot{a}}{\sqrt{\dot{a}^2 + k}}, \quad Q(t, y) = a(t) + |y|\sqrt{\dot{a}^2 + k}, \quad \Sigma(t, y) = 1. \quad (10)$$

Here we included a nonzero spatial curvature k . With this Ansatz, the Friedman equation on the brane follows from (3), and can be expressed in terms of the 4D Hubble parameter $H \equiv \dot{a}/a$. For a simplest case of $k = 0$ it reads [2]

$$H^2 - m_c |H| = 0. \quad (11)$$

This admits a dS solution with $H = m_c$. We emphasize that the minus sign between the two terms in (11) is guaranteed by the choice of the positive sign in front of the terms in (10) that are proportional to $|y|$. If we were to choose the latter signs to be negative, we would have obtained the Friedman equation $H^2 + m_c |H| = 0$, which does not admit the dS solution.

On the other hand, as was discussed in section 1, it is exactly the positive sign in front of the $|y|$ terms in (10) that gives rise to the negative mass difficulties. Hence, the question: can we avoid these problems while still retaining good properties of the self-accelerated solution?

The proposal is to flip the sign in front of the second term on the l.h.s. of (3). In other words, we introduce a new set of equations in which (3) is replaced by:

$$G_{\mu\nu} + m_c(K_{\mu\nu} - g_{\mu\nu}K) = 8\pi G_N T_{\mu\nu}(x), \quad (12)$$

while all the other equations (6),(7) and (8) remain intact. The action functional that gives rise to this new set of equations will be discussed in the next section. Here, for the purposes of finding a classical solution and perturbations about it, it is enough to focus on the equations of motion.

The metric for the self-accelerated solution of the new system of equations (12, 6–8) reads:

$$P(t, y) = 1 - |y| \frac{\ddot{a}}{\sqrt{\dot{a}^2 + k}}, \quad Q(t, y) = a(t) - |y|\sqrt{\dot{a}^2 + k}, \quad \Sigma(t, y) = 1, \quad (13)$$

where we have chosen a negative sign in front of the terms proportional to $|y|$. Let us now see how the change of the positive signs in the metric (10) into the negative

signs in (13) changes the value of the extrinsic curvature evaluated at $y = 0^+$. On the solution (13), $N_\mu = 0$, $N = 1$, and $K_{\mu\nu} = \partial_y g_{\mu\nu}/2$. Hence, at $y = 0^+$ the components of the extrinsic curvature tensor evaluated on the solution (13) equal to *minus* the corresponding components evaluated on (10). Therefore, substitution of (10) into (3) would give the same equation as the substitution of (13) into (12). The corresponding Friedmann equation on the *empty* brane, which now follows from (12) instead of (3), reads:

$$H^2 + \frac{k}{a^2} = m_c \sqrt{H^2 + \frac{k}{a^2}}. \quad (14)$$

For $k = 0$ this coincides with (11) and gives the spatially-flat dS solution with $H = m_c$ (2). For general k the solutions are:

$$ds^2 = (1 - H|y|)^2 \{-dt^2 + a^2(t)(d\chi^2 + S_k^2(\chi)d\Omega^2)\} + dy^2, \quad (15)$$

where $H = m_c$ and $k = -1, 0, 1$ corresponds to the open, flat and closed spatial slicing of 4D dS space, for which $S_k(\chi) = \sinh\chi, \chi, \sin\chi$, respectively³.

The solution (15) should satisfy all the bulk equations (6 – 8), since in the bulk it is locally equivalent to Minkowski space. We checked by direct substitution that (15) solves Eqs. (6 – 8) too.

It is also straightforward to introduce matter/radiation on the brane. Following [2] we obtain the Friedmann equation

$$H^2 + \frac{k}{a^2} = \left(\sqrt{\frac{8\pi G_N}{3}\rho + \frac{m_c^2}{4}} + \frac{m_c}{2} \right)^2, \quad (16)$$

which should be amended by the conventional conservation equation for the fluid of density ρ and pressure p : $\dot{\rho} + 3H(\rho + p) = 0$. The latter being a result of the matter stress-tensor conservation $\nabla^\mu T_{\mu\nu} = 0$, which can be verified, e.g., by taking a covariant derivative of both sides of (12) and using (7).

3 Perturbations

In this section we study the spectrum of small perturbations of the theory (12, 6 – 8). Following [9] we consider the metric perturbations of the form:

$$ds^2 = (\bar{g}_{\mu\nu}(x, y) + \delta g_{\mu\nu}(x, y)) dx^\mu dx^\nu + 2\delta g_{\mu 5} dx^\mu dy + (1 + \delta g_{55}(x, y)) dy^2. \quad (17)$$

The background metric will be distinguished by the bar $\bar{g}_{\mu\nu}(x, y) = A^2(y)\gamma_{\mu\nu}(x)$, where $A \equiv (1 - H|y|)$, and $\gamma_{\mu\nu}(x)$ is a metric tensor for 4D dS space-time.

³There are two other solutions to (14). For $k = 0$ one finds the $H = 0$ flat solution. For $k = -1$ one finds the Milne solution $a(t) = t$.

Let us consider small perturbations about an *empty* (i.e., with $T_{\mu\nu} = 0$) self-accelerated background (15) for $k = 0$. The following expansion of the metric and extrinsic curvature tensors will be used:

$$g_{\mu\nu} = \bar{g}_{\mu\nu} + \delta g_{\mu\nu}, \quad K_{\mu\nu} = \bar{K}_{\mu\nu} + \delta K_{\mu\nu}, \quad (18)$$

$$\bar{K}_{\mu\nu} = n\bar{g}_{\mu\nu}, \quad \bar{K} = \bar{g}^{\mu\nu}\bar{K}_{\mu\nu} = 4n \quad n \equiv \frac{\partial_y A}{A}, \quad (19)$$

where

$$K = g^{\mu\nu}K_{\mu\nu} \equiv \bar{K} + \delta K, \quad \delta K = \bar{g}^{\mu\nu}\delta K_{\mu\nu} - n\bar{g}^{\mu\nu}\delta g_{\mu\nu}. \quad (20)$$

It is straightforward to check that the perturbations of the off-diagonal equation (7) satisfy the following relation

$$\nabla^\mu (\delta K_{\mu\nu} - n\delta g_{\mu\nu}) = \nabla_\nu (\bar{g}^{\rho\sigma}\delta K_{\rho\sigma} - n\bar{g}^{\rho\sigma}\delta g_{\rho\sigma}), \quad (21)$$

where in this section ∇ denotes a 4D covariant derivative for $\bar{g}_{\mu\nu}$.

Furthermore, small perturbations of the {55} equation (8) yield

$$\delta R = 6n(\bar{g}^{\mu\nu}\delta K_{\mu\nu} - n\bar{g}^{\mu\nu}\delta g_{\mu\nu}), \quad (22)$$

while from the source-free junction condition (12) we obtain

$$\delta R|_{0+} = -3m_c(\bar{g}^{\mu\nu}\delta K_{\mu\nu} - n\bar{g}^{\mu\nu}\delta g_{\mu\nu})|_{0+}. \quad (23)$$

Since $m_c = H$, equations (22) and (23) are in contradiction with each other unless the r.h.s. of (23) is zero. Requiring also a continuity of δR we find that the r.h.s. of (22) should be zero for arbitrary y :

$$\bar{g}^{\mu\nu}\delta K_{\mu\nu} - n\bar{g}^{\mu\nu}\delta g_{\mu\nu} = 0. \quad (24)$$

Finally, let us look at small perturbations of the bulk $\{\mu\nu\}$ equation. As long as $T_{\mu\nu} = 0$ we can use the Gaussian normal coordinates and simultaneously choose the following “gauge”⁴

$$\nabla^\mu \delta g_{\mu\nu} = 0, \quad \bar{g}^{\mu\nu}\delta g_{\mu\nu} = 0, \quad \delta g_{55} = \delta g_{\mu 5} = 0. \quad (25)$$

Under these conditions the bulk $\{\mu\nu\}$ equation takes the form:

$$\partial_y^2 \delta g_{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{A^2} (\Box_4 - 4H^2) \delta g_{\mu\nu} = 0, \quad (26)$$

while the junction condition reads as follows:

$$-\frac{1}{2} (\Box_4 - 4H^2 - H\partial_y) \delta g_{\mu\nu}|_{0+} = 0. \quad (27)$$

⁴In general, this is not an acceptable gauge fixing condition when the brane is held straight and the metric is coupled to a non-conformal source. In the latter case one needs to introduce the brane bending mode [16]. We’ll briefly comment on this below.

Having these equations specified, we can calculate the spectrum of Kaluza-Klein (KK) modes. It is convenient to use the following decomposition:

$$\delta g_{\mu\nu}(x, y) \equiv \int h_{\mu\nu}^{(m)}(x) \tilde{f}_m(y) dm, \quad (\square_4 - 2H^2)h_{\mu\nu}^{(m)}(x) = m^2 h_{\mu\nu}^{(m)}(x). \quad (28)$$

By introducing a new coordinate z and a function u_m

$$dz \equiv \frac{dy}{A(y)}, \quad \tilde{f}_m \equiv A^{1/2} u_m, \quad (29)$$

we turn (26) into a Schrödinger-like equation with a boundary condition set by (27). The former reads

$$-\frac{d^2 u_m}{dz^2} + \left(\frac{9H^2}{4} - m^2 \right) u_m = 0, \quad (30)$$

while the boundary condition takes the form:

$$[\partial_z u_m(z)]_{0^-}^{0^+} = - \left(3H - 2\frac{m^2}{H} \right) u_m(0). \quad (31)$$

The spectrum of (30, 31) can be computed. The condition for the modes to be localized on the brane translates into the requirement, $\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dz u_m^2(z) < \infty$.

The above system admits a localized zero-mode solution. For $m = 0$, we obtain $u = c \exp(-3H|z|/2)$ (c being an constant). The zero-mode is normalizable.

Furthermore, one can check that there are no other normalizable modes satisfying both (30) and (31). However, there are an infinite number of continuum states with masses $m_{KK}^2 \geq 9H^2/4$. These are plane-wave normalizable in the z coordinate, and their wave-functions are suppressed on the brane because of the 4D EH term [17] (a similar spectrum for a scalar was discussed in [18]).

Let us compare the above-obtained spectrum to that on the selfaccelerated background (1), found in [6]. The two spectra are similar to each other for $m_{KK}^2 \geq 9H^2/4$, as both of them consist of massive KK modes with suppressed couplings on the brane. However, the localized modes differ. On the background (1) one finds a localized *massive* mode with $m_*^2 = 2H^2$, while the localized mode on (2) is *massless*, $m_0 = 0$. In both massive and massless cases there is an enhanced “gauge symmetry” for the localized modes: in the massive case the symmetry transformation is [19]

$$\delta h_{\mu\nu}^*(x) = (\nabla_\mu \nabla_\nu + H^2 \gamma_{\mu\nu}) \alpha(x), \quad (32)$$

(where α is a gauge transformation parameter) while for the massless case this is just a conventional 4D reparametrization invariance $\delta h_{\mu\nu}^0(x) = \nabla_\mu \zeta_\nu(x) + \nabla_\nu \zeta_\mu(x)$. The symmetry transformation (32) is what allows one to gauge away (in the quadratic approximation and on an empty brane) the dynamics of the brane bending mode, converting the latter into a Lagrange multiplier field [9]. However, the symmetry

(32) is broken once non-conformal sources are switched on. This leads to: (a) propagation of the bending mode with potential ghost-like instability; (b) breakdown of perturbation theory making the linearized calculations unreliable [9, 10].

Things are different in the present case, since we have a localized massless mode. The gauge symmetry for it, $\delta h_{\mu\nu}^0(x) = \nabla_\mu \zeta_\nu + \nabla_\nu \zeta_\mu$, is preserved when the sources are switched on. Then, one should either take into account the brane bending mode, or perform calculations with other acceptable gauge conditions, such as e.g., the 5D harmonic gauge. The expectation is that this won't introduce an additional on-shell degree of freedom. This will be discussed in detail elsewhere.

4 Modified action

In this section we will discuss how one should modify the DGP action in order to flip the sign in front of the extrinsic curvature terms in the junction condition, i.e., to replace (3) by (12). Naively, this can be done by flipping the sign of the 5D Einstein-Hilbert term in the DGP action. However, this would lead to a bulk graviton with a wrong-sign kinetic term. This is not a good course of action.

Instead, we will introduce an additional 5D Einstein-Hilbert term on the brane, with a small *negative* coefficient. This is acceptable as long as there is a 4D Einstein-Hilbert term on the brane with a large positive coefficient. We will show that the effect of the new term is twofold: (I) It allows to flip the desired sign in the junction condition; (II) It relaxes the constraint on the bulk fundamental scale M_* ; the latter can now take an arbitrary value below M_{Pl} , as long as the coefficient of the brane localized 5D Einstein-Hilbert term is tuned appropriately.

We will discuss these properties first on a simple scalar field example. Then we elevate the construction to gravity.

4.1 Scalar example

Let us start with the scalar analog of the DGP action [1]

$$-\frac{M_{\text{Pl}}^2}{2} \int d^4x (\partial_\mu \phi(x, 0))^2 - \frac{M_*^3}{2} \int d^4x dy (\partial_A \phi(x, y))^2, \quad (33)$$

where the dimensionless scalar field ϕ is to mimic a graviton. We impose $\mathbf{Z}_2$ symmetry across the $y = 0$ boundary, and add to the above action the coupling of ϕ to a source J , also localized on the brane, $\int d^4x dy \delta(y) J \phi$. To get the junction condition, we integrate the equation of motion obtained from (33) w.r.t. y , from 0^- to 0^+ . The resulting equation written at $y = 0^+$ reads:

$$-\partial_\mu^2 \phi|_{y=0} - m_c \partial_y \phi|_{y=0^+} = J/M_{\text{Pl}}^2. \quad (34)$$

Here we introduced the definition $m_c = 2M_*^3/M_{\text{Pl}}^2$, and for comparison with gravity, flipped the overall sign of the equation.

Our goal is to modify the action (33) so that the resulting junction condition has an opposite sign in front of the second term on the l.h.s of (34).

For this we introduce an additional term into the action (33). This is just a 5D kinetic term peaked on the brane. To make things tractable, we smear the brane, that is, instead of the Dirac function $\delta(y)$, we use its regularized version $\delta(y) \rightarrow \bar{\delta}(y) \equiv \pi^{-1}\epsilon/(y^2 + \epsilon^2)$, with $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. The term that we'll be adding to (33) then reads:

$$\frac{M^2}{2} \int dx dy \bar{\delta}(y) (\partial_A \phi(x, y))^2. \quad (35)$$

With this term included the variation of the action $\delta S = 0$ with the appropriate boundary conditions gives:

$$-(M_{\text{Pl}}^2 - M^2)\bar{\delta}(y)\partial_\mu^2\phi - M_*^3\partial_\mu^2\phi - \partial_y((M_*^3 - M^2\bar{\delta}(y))\partial_y\phi) = J\bar{\delta}(y). \quad (36)$$

Next we take the integral of both sides of this equation w.r.t. y from $-\epsilon$ to $+\epsilon$, and then turn to the limit

$$M \rightarrow 0, \quad \epsilon \rightarrow 0, \quad M^2/\epsilon \sim M^2\bar{\delta}(0) \equiv \bar{M}^3 > M_*^3, \quad (37)$$

where we keep $\bar{M}$ fixed, and its value bigger than M_* . The resulting equation reads:

$$-\partial_\mu^2\phi + \frac{2(\bar{M}^3 - M_*^3)}{M_{\text{Pl}}^2}\partial_y\phi = J/M_{\text{Pl}}^2. \quad (38)$$

Finally, introducing

$$m_c \equiv \frac{2(\bar{M}^3 - M_*^3)}{M_{\text{Pl}}^2}, \quad (39)$$

where the positive numerical value of m_c will be tuned to the Hubble scale today $m_c \sim H_0 \sim 10^{-42}$ GeV, we get the desired junction conditions

$$-\partial_\mu^2\phi + m_c\partial_y\phi = J/M_{\text{Pl}}^2. \quad (40)$$

The second term on the l.h.s. of (40) has a sign opposite to the one of the analogous term in (34). This accomplishes our goal ⁵.

⁵The Minkowski space propagator following from (40), would have a resonance-like pole on the first Riemann sheet, signaling very slow tachyonic instability [20]. The gravitational counterpart of this theory, also admits Minkowski space as a solution, in addition to the dS solution we are interested in. Perturbations about the former will have a similar pole on the first Riemann sheet, showing instability of the Minkowski solution. This instability should be more severe then in the scalar case, as the tachyon-like pole here would appear for a tensor state (i.e., the longitudinal scalar mode would acquire a ghost-like kinetic term). This is encouraging, since our eventual goal is to have only the stable dS background. In the latter case the pole structure of the propagator is modified due to the background. The kinetic term of the longitudinal mode should get cured by the dS curvature effects.

Two comments are in order here. First, the wrong-sign kinetic term (35) that is peaked only on the brane is dominated by the large positive 4D kinetic term in (33), proportional to $M_{\text{Pl}}^2 > M^2$. Second, the number of adjusted parameters here is the same as in DGP: In (33) one should tune the value of M_* such that the ratio $2M_*^3/M_{\text{Pl}}^2$ is of order H_0 . On the other hand, in the action with the additional term (35) the value of $M_* < M_{\text{Pl}}$ can be arbitrary, however, for a given value of M_* one should tune the value of $\bar{M}$ so that (39) is of order H_0 . In the case of gravity, to which we'll turn in the next subsection, this has an additional benefit of relaxing the constraint on the bulk scale of gravity, M_* , which now can be an arbitrary scale somewhat lower than M_{Pl} .

4.2 Gravity

The DGP gravitational action is [1]

$$S = \frac{M_{\text{Pl}}^2}{2} \int d^4x \sqrt{g_4} R(g_4) + \frac{M_*^3}{2} \int d^4x dy \sqrt{g_5} \mathcal{R}(g_5), \quad (41)$$

where $g_{4\mu\nu} \equiv g_{\mu\nu}(x, 0)$, and g_5 refers to the full 5D metric; R and $\mathcal{R}$ are the four-dimensional and five-dimensional Ricci scalars respectively, and M_* , as before, stands for the fundamental gravitational scale of the bulk theory. The brane is located at $y = 0$ and $\mathbf{Z}_2$ symmetry across the brane is imposed. The boundary Gibbons-Hawking term should be taken into account to warrant the correct Einstein equations in the bulk. The matter fields, that are also omitted here for simplicity, are assumed to be localized on the brane.

The above action gives rise to the equations of motion (3,6-8). As we discussed previously, we'd like our equations to be (12, 6-8) instead. To reach this goal, we proceed as in the scalar case discussed in the previous subsection.

We smooth out the brane by replacing $\delta(y) \rightarrow \bar{\delta}(y)$, and add the following boundary (worldvolume) term to the action:

$$-\frac{M^2}{2} \int d^4x dy \bar{\delta}(y) \sqrt{g_5} \mathcal{R}(g_5) = -\frac{M^2}{2} \int d^4x dy \bar{\delta}(y) \sqrt{g} N (R + K^2 - K_{\mu\nu}^2), \quad (42)$$

where the r.h.s. of (42) is obtained by using the standard ADM decomposition. The total action in the ADM formalism reads:

$$S_{\text{mod}} = \frac{M_{\text{Pl}}^2}{2} \int d^4x \sqrt{g_4} R(g_4) + \frac{M_*^3}{2} \int d^4x dy \sqrt{g} N (R + K^2 - K_{\mu\nu}^2) - \frac{M^2}{2} \int d^4x dy \bar{\delta}(y) \sqrt{g} N (R + K^2 - K_{\mu\nu}^2), \quad (43)$$

where it is implied that the 4D EH term is also smeared over the same scale as the 5D term ⁶. The equations of motion are straightforward to derive from (43). The

⁶For the regularization of 4D and 5D EH terms, see, [21] and [22], respectively.

$\{\mu\nu\}$ equation in the bulk, and $\{\mu 5\}$ and $\{55\}$ equations read as follows:

$$G_{\mu\nu}^{(5)} = 0 \quad \text{for } |y| > \epsilon, \quad (44)$$

$$(M_*^3 - M^2 \bar{\delta}(y)) (\nabla^\mu K_{\mu\nu} - \nabla_\nu K) = 0, \quad (45)$$

$$(M_*^3 - M^2 \bar{\delta}(y)) (R - K^2 + K_{\mu\nu} K^{\mu\nu}) = 0. \quad (46)$$

As in the scalar case, we will be looking at this theory in the limit (37). The above equations reduce to (6-8) ⁷.

The Israel condition across the brane gets modified because of the new term in (43). In the limit (37) the junction condition reads:

$$G_{\mu\nu} + \frac{2(\bar{M}^3 - M_*^3)}{M_{\text{Pl}}^2} (K_{\mu\nu} - g_{\mu\nu} K) = 8\pi G_N T_{\mu\nu}(x). \quad (47)$$

If $\bar{M} = 0$, as in (41), we get back the result (3) with $m_c = 2M_*^3/M_{\text{Pl}}^2$. However, $\bar{M}$ does not have to be zero. For an arbitrary value of M_* we tune the value of $\bar{M}$ so that the crossover scale (39), which appears in (47), is adjusted to the value of the present-day Hubble scale $m_c \sim H_0 \sim 10^{-42}$ GeV. Hence, (47) recovers (12).

A few important comments:

(I) The number of adjusted parameters here is the same as in DGP. In (41) one should tune the value of M_* , so that the ratio $2M_*^3/M_{\text{Pl}}^2$ is of order H_0 . This constrains $M_* \sim 100$ MeV. On the other hand, in (43) the value of M_* is arbitrary. In order to get the right crossover scale for a given value of M_* , one should tune the value of $\bar{M}$ so that (39) is of order H_0 . This has an additional benefit that the bulk scale of gravity, M_* , can take an arbitrary value $M_* < M_{\text{Pl}}$.

(II) The limit (37) is a mathematical simplification. In reality the brane will have a width ϵ (in simplest cases $\epsilon \sim M_*^{-1}$). If a nonzero brane width effects are kept track of, then the junction condition (47) will contain additional terms proportional to M^2 . For instance, among other terms, there'll be ones proportional to

$$\frac{M^2}{M_{\text{Pl}}^2} \left(G_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} g_{\mu\nu} (K^2 - K_{\mu\nu}^2) - 2(K_\mu^\alpha K_{\alpha\nu} - K K_{\mu\nu}) \right). \quad (48)$$

Such terms can be neglected as long as $M \ll M_{\text{Pl}}$. On the other hand, if $M \lesssim M_{\text{Pl}}$ the above terms can introduce modifications in the Friedman equation (11), and/or need to rescale the overall Newton's constant.

(III) In the above construction the function $F(y) \equiv (M_*^3 - M^2 \bar{\delta}(y))$ asymptotes to M_*^3 away from the brane, $|y| \gg \epsilon$, while it approaches the negative value, $(M_*^3 - \bar{M}^3) < 0$ when $y \rightarrow 0$. Being a continuous function, $F(y)$ should pass through zero. On the other hand, $F(y)$ is a function that determines the coefficient in front of the 5D EH term in the action (43). This may rise some concerns. Within the brane, i.e., for $|y| \lesssim \epsilon$ the 5D EH term flips the sign, and the concern may be that this could

⁷Eqs. (45) and (46) also flip the overall sign on the brane for our choice of $\bar{M}$. This is important for understanding the perturbations on the self-accelerated background.

lead to some negative-sign kinetic terms. Precisely when the function $F(y)$ flips its sign, a large positive-sign 4D EH term (43) becomes peaked on the brane. The latter dominates, as long as $M_{\text{Pl}}^2 > M^2$. Moreover, the kinetic term of the longitudinal modes, which cannot be helped by the 4D EH term, would become normal due to the dS background effects, as the calculations of the previous section suggest⁸.

A related concern may arise in the region where $F(y)$ approaches zero. There, the additional helicity states of graviton could become infinitely strongly coupled in a *naive* perturbation theory. However, as in the case of massive gravity, and the DGP model, one should expect that a smooth transition to the $F(y) \rightarrow 0$ limit is recovered in the full nonlinear theory [23, 4]. By now there are a few examples and arguments supporting the above expectation, see, e.g., [24, 25, 26], [11, 12].

5 Discussions and outlook

We discussed a model defined by the equations (12, 6–8), or by the action (43), and show that it has the self-accelerated solution with decreasing metric in the bulk (2). The spectrum of small perturbations on the background (2) is different from the spectrum on (1). The lowest mode is a localized massless spin-2 state. The low energy theory of this mode exhibits 4D general covariance. Most importantly, however, there is no massive localized spin-2 state, the one that causes difficulties for the background (1) when non-conformal sources are switched on it [9]. All the massive states in the present case appear above the threshold, $m^2 \geq 9H^2/4$.

Nonlinear dynamics of this model is expected to have features similar to DGP, as well as different ones. The differences may arise because of the zero mode. On the other hand, the KK gravitons form a massive (though light $m \sim H$) resonance-like state which should participate, along with the zero mode, in a one-graviton exchange amplitude. This would lead to the vDVZ discontinuity [27] in the linearized theory. However, the continuity should be expected to be recovered in the full nonlinear theory [4], with small, but potentially measurable deviations from 4D GR [28, 29] (see also, [30, 11]).

Is the obtained background (2) acceptable from the point of view of observational cosmology? The time evolution in (2) is equivalent to that of (1). The latter has been studied in detail [3],[31]–[40]. This evolution is rather restrictive. For instance, the equation of state parameter today, $w_0 \equiv w(z=0)$, gets related to the matter density Ω_M , as $w_0 = -1/(1 + \Omega_M)$ (this is for the $k=0$ case [3]). Fitting the supernova data with such an expansion favors a low value for Ω_M , which is in tension with the determination of the matter density from CMB observables [40]. It has been suggested in [40] to use the open ($k=-1$) universe to obtain a better fit. Forthcoming measurements of the low z supernovae (which are important as

⁸One could consider adding to the DGP action (41) only the $M^2 F(y)(K^2 - K_{\mu\nu}^2)$ term. However, this would also change the {55} equation in addition to modifying the junction condition. Then, one would need to study the new background solutions.

the calibration points) may affect the above considerations. Moreover, the issues of determination of the matter content of the Universe may be influenced by the non-perturbative phenomena leading to the mass screening [11, 12]. The questions of how much screening (or anti-screening) is there, will depend on a particular model at hand. These issues have not been understood yet in the present context.

Finally, an additional benefit of the new term in (43) is that it allows to relax the constraint on the bulk gravity scale. The latter can take an arbitrary value below M_{Pl} . This opens a window for a possible string theory realization of this model, or its $D > 5$ counterparts [41, 42] (for earlier proposals see [43, 44]).

With the new term included, the analog of the conventional (Minkowski) solution of DGP could also be studied. In the latter case, the function $F(y)$ should not flip its sign as it interpolates from its bulk value, M_*^3 , down to lower *positive* value on the brane $M_*^3 - \bar{M}^3$ ($F(y)$ could emerge as a profile of some 5D scalar field which couples to 5D EH term). It would be interesting to study the nonperturbative solutions, similar to those of [11], [12], in this context.

Acknowledgments

The author thanks G. Dvali, O. Pujolás and R. Scoccimarro for useful discussions. The work is supported by NASA grant NNG05GH34G and NSF grant 0403005.

References

- [1] G. Dvali, G. Gabadadze and M. Porrati, Phys. Lett. **B485**, 208 (2000) [hep-th/0005016].
- [2] C. Deffayet, Phys. Lett. B **502**, 199 (2001) [arXiv:hep-th/0010186].
- [3] C. Deffayet, G. R. Dvali and G. Gabadadze, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 044023 (2002) [astro-ph/0105068].
- [4] C. Deffayet, G. R. Dvali, G. Gabadadze and A. I. Vainshtein, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 044026 (2002) [arXiv:hep-th/0106001].
- [5] M. A. Luty, M. Porrati and R. Rattazzi, JHEP **0309**, 029 (2003) [arXiv:hep-th/0303116].
- [6] K. Koyama, Phys. Rev. D **72**, 123511 (2005) [arXiv:hep-th/0503191].
- [7] D. Gorbunov, K. Koyama and S. Sibiryakov, Phys. Rev. D **73**, 044016 (2006) [arXiv:hep-th/0512097].
- [8] C. Charmousis, R. Gregory, N. Kaloper and A. Padilla, JHEP **0610**, 066 (2006) [arXiv:hep-th/0604086].

- [9] C. Deffayet, G. Gabadadze and A. Iglesias, JCAP **0608**, 012 (2006) [arXiv:hep-th/0607099].
- [10] G. Dvali, arXiv:hep-th/0610013.
- [11] G. Gabadadze and A. Iglesias, Phys. Rev. D **72**, 084024 (2005) [arXiv:hep-th/0407049]; Phys. Lett. B **632**, 617 (2006) [arXiv:hep-th/0508201]. Phys. Lett. B **639**, 88 (2006) [arXiv:hep-th/0603199].
- [12] G. Dvali, G. Gabadadze, O. Pujolas and R. Rahman, arXiv:hep-th/0612016.
- [13] N. Kaloper and A. D. Linde, Phys. Rev. D **59**, 101303 (1999) [arXiv:hep-th/9811141].
- [14] R. M. Wald, “General Relativity,” 1984.
- [15] R. Arnowitt, S. Deser and C. W. Misner, ”Gravitation: an introduction to current research”, L. Witten ed. (Wiley 1962), pp 227–265; arXiv:gr-qc/0405109.
- [16] J. Garriga and T. Tanaka, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 2778 (2000) [arXiv:hep-th/9911055].
- [17] G. R. Dvali, G. Gabadadze, M. Kolanovic and F. Nitti, Phys. Rev. D **64**, 084004 (2001) [arXiv:hep-ph/0102216].
- [18] O. Pujolas, JCAP **0610**, 004 (2006) [arXiv:hep-th/0605257].
- [19] S. Deser and R. I. Nepomechie, Annals Phys. **154**, 396 (1984). S. Deser and A. Waldron, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 031601 (2001) [arXiv:hep-th/0102166].
- [20] G. Gabadadze, arXiv:hep-th/0408118; In Ian Kogan Memorial Volume, Shifman, M. (ed.) et al. World Scientific, 2004; vol.2, pp 1061-1130.
- [21] G. Dvali, G. Gabadadze, X. r. Hou and E. Sefusatti, Phys. Rev. D **67**, 044019 (2003) [arXiv:hep-th/0111266].
- [22] M. Porrati and J. W. Rombouts, Phys. Rev. D **69**, 122003 (2004) [arXiv:hep-th/0401211].
- [23] A. I. Vainshtein, Phys. Lett. B **39** (1972) 393.
- [24] A. Lue, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 043509 (2002) [arXiv:hep-th/0111168].
- [25] A. Gruzinov, New Astron. **10**, 311 (2005) [arXiv:astro-ph/0112246].
- [26] T. Tanaka, Phys. Rev. D **69**, 024001 (2004) [arXiv:gr-qc/0305031].
- [27] H. van Dam and M. J. G. Veltman, Nucl. Phys. B **22**, 397 (1970); V. I. Zakharov, JETP Lett. **12** (1970) 312 [Pisma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **12** (1970) 447].

- [28] G. Dvali, A. Gruzinov and M. Zaldarriaga, Phys. Rev. D **68**, 024012 (2003) [arXiv:hep-ph/0212069].
- [29] A. Lue and G. Starkman, Phys. Rev. D **67**, 064002 (2003) [arXiv:astro-ph/0212083].
- [30] L. Iorio, Class. Quant. Grav. **22**, 5271 (2005) [arXiv:gr-qc/0504053]; JCAP **0509**, 006 (2005) [arXiv:gr-qc/0508047]; JCAP **0601**, 008 (2006).
- [31] C. Deffayet, S. J. Landau, J. Raux, M. Zaldarriaga and P. Astier, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 024019 (2002) [arXiv:astro-ph/0201164].
- [32] A. Lue, R. Scoccimarro and G. Starkman, Phys. Rev. D **69**, 044005 (2004) [arXiv:astro-ph/0307034]. Phys. Rev. D **69**, 124015 (2004).
- [33] D. Jain, A. Dev and J. S. Alcaniz, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 083511 (2002) [arXiv:astro-ph/0206224]. J. S. Alcaniz, D. Jain and A. Dev, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 067301 (2002).
- [34] M. Ishak, A. Upadhye and D. N. Spergel, Phys. Rev. D **74**, 043513 (2006) [arXiv:astro-ph/0507184].
- [35] E. V. Linder, Phys. Rev. D **72**, 043529 (2005) [arXiv:astro-ph/0507263].
- [36] L. Knox, Y. S. Song and J. A. Tyson, arXiv:astro-ph/0503644.
- [37] R. Maartens and E. Majerotto, Phys. Rev. D **74**, 023004 (2006) [arXiv:astro-ph/0603353].
- [38] K. Koyama and R. Maartens, JCAP **0601**, 016 (2006) [arXiv:astro-ph/0511634].
- [39] I. Sawicki and S. M. Carroll, arXiv:astro-ph/0510364.
- [40] Y. S. Song, I. Sawicki and W. Hu, arXiv:astro-ph/0606286.
- [41] G. R. Dvali and G. Gabadadze, Phys. Rev. D **63**, 065007 (2001) [arXiv:hep-th/0008054].
- [42] G. Gabadadze and M. Shifman, Phys. Rev. D **69**, 124032 (2004) [arXiv:hep-th/0312289].
- [43] I. Antoniadis, R. Minasian and P. Vanhove, Nucl. Phys. B **648**, 69 (2003) [arXiv:hep-th/0209030].
- [44] E. Kohlprath, Nucl. Phys. B **697**, 243 (2004) [arXiv:hep-th/0311251]. E. Kohlprath and P. Vanhove, arXiv:hep-th/0409197.